UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,647	09/29/2004	Gueorgui Momtchilov	2006579-0314	5646

69665   7590   10/21/2008

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART / CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC.
TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER
FAN, HUA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2456	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/21/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>11 September 2008</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20,23-53 and 56-76</u> is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20, 23-53 and 56-76</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to the Amendment/Remarks filed on 9/11/2008. Claims

1-20, 23-53 and 56-76 are pending. Claims 1-4, 11-16, 23-53, 56-68, and 74-76 have been

amended. Claims 21-22 and 54-55 have been cancelled. No new claim has been added.

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed 9/11/2008 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive. All arguments including those that directed to the newly added limitations have been

addressed and responded to in the following rejections to the corresponding claims.

Specification

2.   The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the

claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the

following is required: For example: The recitation of "computer readable medium" in claims 34-

43, 44-53, 56, 57-65, and 66 lacks antecedent basis in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making
> and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it
> pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode
> contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4.   Claims 34-43, 44-53, 56, 57-65, and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph,

as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contains subject matter

which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled

in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the

claimed invention. The limitation cited in claims 34-43, 44-53, 56, 57-65, and 66, "computer

readable medium" does not find support in the originally filed application. The applicant is

suggested to cancel the new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or
> any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and
> requirements of this title.

The USPTO "Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject
Matter Eligibility" (Official Gazette notice of 22 November 2005), Annex IV, reads as
follows:

> Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive
> material." In this context, "functional descriptive material" consists of data structures and computer programs
> which impart functionality when employed as a computer component. (The definition of "data structure" is "a
> physical or logical relationship among data elements, designed to support specific data manipulation functions."
> The New IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronics Terms 308 (5th ed. 1993).) "Nonfunctional
> descriptive material" includes but is not limited to music, literary works and a compilation or mere arrangement
> of data.
> When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it becomes structurally and
> functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the
> function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d
> 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (claim to data structure stored on a computer readable medium that increases
> computer efficiency held statutory) and Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1360-61, 31 USPQ2d at 1759 (claim to
> computer having a specific data structure stored in memory held statutory product-by-process claim) with
> Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory).
> In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element
> which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the
> computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. See Lowry, 32
> F.3d at 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d at 1035.

6.   Claims 34-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed

to non-statutory subject matter as follows. Claim 34 defines a **computer readable program**

embodying functional descriptive material. However, the claim does not define a "computer-

readable medium or computer-readable memory" that the computer readable program is recorded

on, and is thus non-statutory for that reason (i.e., "When functional descriptive material is

recorded on some computer-readable medium it becomes structurally and functionally

interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the

function of the descriptive material to be realized" – Guidelines Annex IV). The scope of the

presently claimed invention encompasses products that are not necessarily computer readable,

and thus NOT able to impart any functionality of the recited program. The examiner suggests

amending the claim(s) to embody the program on "computer-readable medium" or equivalent;

assuming the specification does NOT define the computer readable medium as a "signal",

"carrier wave", or "transmission medium" which are deemed non-statutory (refer to "note"

below). Any amendment to the claim should be commensurate with its corresponding disclosure.

Note:
        "A transitory, propagating signal … is not a "process, machine, manufacture, or
composition of matter." Those four categories define the explicit scope and reach of subject
matter patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 101; thus, such a signal cannot be patentable subject
matter." (*In re Petrus A.C.M. Nuijten;* Fed Cir, 2006-1371, 9/20/2007)

        Should the full scope of the claim as properly read in light of the disclosure encompass

non-statutory subject matter such as a "signal", the claim as a whole would be non-statutory.

Should the applicant's specification define or exemplify the computer readable medium or

memory (or whatever language applicant chooses to recite a computer readable medium

equivalent) as statutory tangible products such as a hard drive, ROM, RAM, etc, **as well as** a

non-statutory entity such as a "signal", "carrier wave", or "transmission medium", the examiner

suggests amending the claim to *include* the disclosed tangible computer readable storage media,

while at the same time *excluding* the intangible transitory media such as signals, carrier waves,

etc. No new matter should be entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 1, 3, 10-12, 15, 23, 34, 36, 43-45, 48, 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

unpatentable over Arteaga et al (EP 1187022), in view of Soin et al (US publication

2005/0091302).

As to claim 1, Arteaga et al. discloses a method for handling events occurring at a client

([0042]), said method comprising:

(a) providing a client communicating with a server over a network (figure 1);

(b) detecting an event notification regarding a device in communication with the client

([0042], "When a Hardware Event or a User-Control Event occurs at the client device 12I, the

client device sends a data message to the application 13I to identify the event and any

accompanying parameters that further specify the event or data that is associated with the

event");

(c) redirecting said event notification to the server from the client ([0042], "When a

Hardware Event or a User-Control Event occurs at the client device 12I, the client device sends a

data message to the application 13I to identify the event and any accompanying parameters that

further specify the event or data that is associated with the event"), and

(d) receiving, from the server, in response to the redirection of the event notification, a

command directed to said device ([0042]-[0044], see especially paragraph [0044], "upon receipt

of event messages from client device 12I, application 13I performs the processing specified by

the commands in the application program…this processing culminates with a change to the user

interface…Such change to the user interface accordingly is transmitted from the application 13I

to the client device 12I").

Arteaga et al. does not expressly disclose the events are plug-and-play events. Soin et al.

discloses detecting plug-and-play events ([0112]-[0113]).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. with the method disclosed by Soin et al.

regarding detecting plug-and-play events. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would

have been to discover devices (Soin et al., [0029]).

Arteaga et al. does not expressly disclose the communication between client and server

uses presentation-level protocol. Soin et al. discloses the communication between client and

server uses presentation-level protocol ("RDP" [0092]).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. with the method disclosed by Soin et al.

regarding using presentation-level protocol for communication between client and server. The

suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to support different types of network

topologies and multiple LAN protocols (Soin et al., [0073]).

As to claim 3, Arteaga et al. discloses the claimed invention substantially as claimed as

discussed in claim 1, but does not expressly disclose the redirecting said event notification is via

a virtual channel. Soin et al. disclose using virtual channel to redirect events ([0074]; [0079]-

[0081])

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. with the method disclosed by Soin et al.

regarding using virtual channel to redirect events. The suggestion/motivation of the combination

would have been to support different types of network topologies and multiple LAN protocols
(Soin et al., [0073]).

As to claim 10, Arteaga-Soin et al discloses the device in communication with the client
uses one of the USB (Universal Serial Bus) protocol, IEEE 1394 protocol, Bluetooth protocol,
wi-fi protocol, wireless protocol, and infrared (IR) protocol to communicate with the client (Soin
et al, wireless protocol, [0003]; [0008]; [0021]).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the
art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. with the method disclosed by Soin et al.
regarding using wireless protocol for communication between the device and the client. The
suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to allow easy access for mobile
users, provide an easy connection where a wired solution is not practical (Soin et al., [0101]).

As to claim 11, Arteaga et al. discloses a method for handling events occurring at a client
in communication with a server ([0042]; figure 1), said method comprising the steps of:

a) receiving from said client an event notification regarding a device in communication
with the client ([0042]);

b) notifying an application program hosted by the server of the occurrence of the event
notification ([0042]);

c) receiving, in response to notification of the occurrence of the event notification, a
command from the application program hosted by the server, the command directed to the device
([0042]-[0044], see especially paragraph [0044], "upon receipt of event messages from client
device 12I, application 13I performs the processing specified by the commands in the application

program…this processing culminates with a change to the user interface…Such change to the

user interface accordingly is transmitted from the application 13I to the client device 12I"); and

d) transmitting to the client a command directed to the device ([0043]-[0044]).

Arteaga et al does not expressly disclose detecting plug-and-play evens. Soin et al.

discloses detecting plug-and-play events ([0112]-[0113]).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. with the method disclosed by Soin et al.

regarding detecting plug-and-play events. See similar motivation in claim 1 rejection.

Arteaga et al. does not expressly disclose the communication between client and server

uses presentation-level protocol. Soin et al. discloses the communication between client and

server uses presentation-level protocol ("RDP" [0092]).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. with the method disclosed by Soin et al.

regarding using presentation-level protocol for communication between client and server. See

similar motivation in claim 1 rejection.

As to claim 12, see similar rejection to claim 3.

As to claim 15, Arteaga-Soin discloses the method of claim 11 wherein <u>notifying an</u>

<u>application program</u> further comprises: transmitting the event notification to applications

communicating with the server within the session (Arteaga, [0042]).

As to claim 23, Arteaga et al. discloses a method for handling events occurring at a client

in communication with a server ([0042]), said method comprising:

a) receiving from said client an event notification regarding a device in communication with the client ([0042);

b) notifying an application program hosted by the server of the occurrence of the event notification ([0042]);

c) receiving, <u>in response to notification of the occurrence of the event notification, a command</u> from the application program hosted by the server a command directed to the device ([0042]-[0044], see especially paragraph [0044], "upon receipt of event messages from client device 12I, application 13I performs the processing specified by the commands in the application program…this processing culminates with a change to the user interface…Such change to the user interface accordingly is transmitted from the application 13I to the client device 12I"); and

d) transmitting to the client a command directed to the device ([0043]-[0044]).

Arteaga et al. does not expressly disclose the communication between client and server uses presentation-level protocol. Soin et al. discloses the communication between client and server uses presentation-level protocol ("RDP" [0092]).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. with the method disclosed by Soin et al. regarding using presentation-level protocol for communication between client and server. See similar motivation in claim 1 rejection.

Claims (34, 36, 43-45, 48, 56) are computer readable medium claims corresponding to method claims (1, 3, 10-12, 15, 23). Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon method claims respectively.

9.   Claims 2, 4, 13-14, 16, 35, 37, 46-47, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

unpatentable over Arteaga et al., in view of Soin et al., as applied to claim 1 above, and further in

view of Lueckhoff et al (US patent 7171478).

As to claim 2, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. discloses transmitting the event

notification to the server using virtual channel (Arteaga et al., [0042]; Soin et al., [0074]).

However, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. does not expressly disclose generating context

identifier and binding the context identifier to the event notification. Lueckhoff et al. discloses

generating context identifier (abstract; col. 7, line 41 – col. 8, line 6) and binding the context

identifier to the event notification, and sending the bound event notification to server (col. 8, line

56 – col. 9, line 11).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. with the method

disclosed by Lueckhoff et al. regarding generating context identifier and binding the context

identifier to the event notification, and sending the bound event notification to server. The

suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to couple session management for

the user context with that of application on server (Lueckhoff et al., col. 7, lines 55-57).

As to claim 4, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. discloses issuing a command to the

identified device (Arteaga et al., ([0042]-[0044]). However, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al.

does not expressly disclose a generated context identifier; identifying the device using the

context identifier. Lueckhoff et al. discloses receiving from a server a command including a

generated context identifier (col. 7, line 49 – col. 8, line 6) and identifying the event source using

the context identifier (col. 7, line 49 – col. 8, line 6).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. with the method disclosed by Lueckhoff et al. regarding generating context identifier and binding the context identifier to the event notification, and sending the bound event notification to server. See similar motivation in claim 2 rejection.

As to claim 13, see similar rejection to claim 2.

As to claim 14, Arteaga et al. discloses creating a server-unique name to identify the device connected to the client that generated the event notification ([0042]). Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. does not expressly disclose using server unique name to map the client device to a specific session on the server established by the presentation level protocol. Lueckhoff et al. discloses using server unique name to map the client event source to a specific session on the server (col. 7, line 49 – col. 8, line 6).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. with the method disclosed by Lueckhoff et al. regarding server unique name to map the client event source to a specific session on the server. See similar motivation in claim 2 rejection.

As to claim 16, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. does not disclose transmitting the event notification only to applications communicating with the server which have previously registered a callback for a type of event causing the event notification. Lueckhoff et al. discloses transmitting the event notification only to applications communicating with the server which have previously registered a callback for a type of event causing the event notification (col. 7, line 59 – col. 8, line 15; col. 9, lines 22-46).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. with the method disclosed by Lueckhoff et al. regarding transmitting the event notification only to applications communicating with the server which have previously registered a callback for a type of event causing the event notification. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to invoke the appropriate application on the server (Lueckhoff et al., col. 7, lines 60-62).

Claims (35, 37, 46-47, 49) are computer-readable medium claims corresponding to method claims (2, 4, 13-14, 15) respectively. Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon method claims respectively.

10.   Claims 5, 7, 17, 19, 38, 40, 50, and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Arteaga et al., in view of US Soin et al., as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Coppinger et al (US patent 6982656).

As to claim 5, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. does not expressly disclose the method of claim 1 wherein said event notification is generated as a result of a device arrival. Coppinger et al. discloses transmitting a mobile asset arrival message to server (abstract; figure 1, 3).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. with the method disclosed by Coppinger et al. regarding transmitting a mobile asset arrival message to server. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to monitor and report the status of a mobile asset (Coppinger et al., abstract, lines 1-4).

As to claim 7, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. does not expressly disclose the method of claim 1 wherein said event notification is generated as a result of a device removal. Coppinger et al. discloses transmitting a mobile asset departure message to server (abstract; figure 1, 3).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. with the method disclosed by Coppinger et al. regarding transmitting a mobile asset departure message to server. See similar motivation in claim 5 rejection.

As to claim 17, see similar rejection to claim 5.

As to claim 19, see similar rejection to claim 7.

Claims (38, 40, 50, 52) are computer-readable medium claims corresponding to method claims (5, 7, 17, 19). Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon method claims respectively.

11.   Claims 6, 8, 18, 20, 39, 41, 51, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Arteaga et al., in view of Soin et al., and Coppinger et al., as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Ferlitsch (US publication 2002/0114004).

As to claim 6, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. and Coppinger et al. does not disclose the method of claim 5 wherein said command is an open command. Ferlitsch discloses server sends an open command to device ([0084]).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. and Coppinger et al., with the method disclosed by Ferlitsch regarding server sends an open command to device. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to enable a three-way printing

source/server/printing device communicating using a virtual socket concept (Ferlitsch, [0084],

lines 1-3).

As to claim 8, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. and Coppinger et al. does not disclose

the method of claim 5 wherein said command is a close command. Ferlitsch discloses server

sends a close command to device ([0084]).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. and Coppinger et al.,

with the method disclosed by Ferlitsch regarding server sends a close command to device. See

similar motivation in claim 6 rejection.

As to claim 18, see similar rejection to claim 6.

As to claim 20, see similar rejection to claim 8.

Claims (39, 41, 51, 53) are computer readable medium claims corresponding to method

claims (6, 8, 18, 20). Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon method claims

respectively.

12.   Claims 9 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Arteaga et al.,

in view of Soin et al., as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ferlitsch (US

publication 2002/0114004).

As to claim 9, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. does not expressly disclose the method

of claim 1 wherein said event notification is associated with at least one of a GUID, vendor ID,

product ID and actual device name. Ferlitsch discloses message is associated with at least one of

a GUID, vendor ID, product ID and actual device name (figure 12-13).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al., with the method disclosed by Ferlitsch message containing device name. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to provide message source information (Ferlitsch, [0094], lines 4-6).

Claim 42 is a computer readable medium claim corresponding to method claim 9. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon method claim.

13.   Claims 24, 26, 57, 59, 67-68, and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Arteaga et al., in view of Soin et al., as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Morris (US publication 2002/0159419).

As to claim 24, Arteaga et al in view of Soin et al disclose a method for informing a server about the presence of devices connected to a client, said method comprising:

(a) providing a client communicating with a server over a network using a presentation-level protocol;

(b) detecting a plug-and-play event notification regarding a device in communication with the client;

(c) redirecting said event notification to the server over a network; and

(d) receiving, <u>in response to the redirection of the event notification, a command</u> from the server, the command directed to said device (See similar rejection to claim 1 above).

However, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. does not expressly disclose emulating a plug-and-play event notification. Morris discloses emulating plug-and-play event ([0020]-[0021]; [0023], lines 20-25).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al., with the method disclosed by Morris regarding emulating a plug-and-play event notification. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to take advantage of USB technology, particularly the "plug and play" capability, to simplify the installation and use of Bluetooth-enabled and other wireless peripherals (Morris, [0010]).

As to claim 26, see similar rejection to claim 3.

Claims (57, 59) are computer readable medium claims corresponding to method claims (24, 26). Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon method claims respectively.

As to claim 67, Arteaga et al in view of Soin et al. disclose a method for detecting devices communicating with a client that have been mapped into a session on a server (Arteaga et al., [0042]; Soin et al., [0089], see similar rejection to claim 1), said method comprising the steps of: launching an application in a user session on a server intercepting device notification in the server-based user session (Arteaga et al, [0042]-[0043]); redirecting the device notification to the server (Arteaga et al., [0042]); and notifying said application hosted by the server of the occurrence of the event notification (Arteaga et al., [0042]), and

receiving, in response to notification of the occurrence of the event, a command from the application hosted by the server, the command directed to the at least one device ([0042]-[0044], see especially paragraph [0044], "upon receipt of event messages from client device 12I, application 13I performs the processing specified by the commands in the application

program…this processing culminates with a change to the user interface…Such change to the user interface accordingly is transmitted from the application 13I to the client device 12I").

Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. does not expressly disclose an enumerating device method. Morris discloses a method of detecting one or more peripheral devices ([0020]).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al., with the method disclosed by Morris regarding detecting one or more peripheral devices. See similar motivation in claim 24 rejection.

Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. does not expressly disclose <u>an arrival event</u> notification or emulating an arrival event for at least one device enumerated by the redirected method, said device being a device in communication with a client system that was mapped into the user session prior to said application launch. Morris discloses an <u>arrival event</u> detection ([0009], "detects the attachment of a device to a USB port") and emulating plug-and-play events ([0020]-[0021]; [0023], lines 20-25. It is to be noted that the plug-and-play event is an arrival event).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al., with the method disclosed by Morris regarding emulating a plug-and-play event notification. See similar motivation in claim 24 rejection.

As to claim 68, Arteaga et al in view of Soin et al disclose a method for handling plug-and-play events occurring at a client, said method comprising:

(a) detecting a plug-and-play event notification regarding a device communicating with the client;

(b) redirecting said event notification to a server over a network; and

(c) receiving, in <u>response to the redirection of the event notification, a command</u> from the server, the command directed to said device (See similar rejection to claim 1).

However, Arteaga et al. does not expressly disclose USB connection between the device and the client. Morris discloses a USB connection between device and client (abstract).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al., with the method disclosed by Morris regarding USB connection. See similar motivation in claim 24 rejection.

As to claim 75, see similar rejection to claim 3.

14.   Claims 69 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Arteaga et al., in view of Soin et al., and Morris, as applied to claim 68 above, and further in view of Coppinger et al (US patent 6982656).

As to claim 69, see similar rejection to claim 5.

As to claim 71, see similar rejection to claim 7.

15.   Claims 70 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Arteaga et al., in view of Soin et al., Morris, and Coppinger et al., as applied to claim 69 above, and further in view of Ferlitsch (US publication 2002/0114004).

As to claim 70, see similar rejection to claim 6.

As to claim 72, see similar rejection to claim 8.

16.   Claim 73 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Arteaga et al., in view

of Soin et al., and Morris, as applied to claim 68 above, and further in view of Ferlitsch (US

publication 2002/0114004).

As to claim 73, see similar rejection to claim 9.

17.   Claims 25, 27-31, 58, 60-64, 74, and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

unpatentable over Arteaga et al., in view of Soin et al., and Morris, as applied to claim 24 above,

and further in view of Lueckhoff et al (US patent 7171478).

As to claim 25, see similar rejection to claim 2.

As to claim 27, see similar rejection to claim 4.

As to claim 28, see similar rejection to claim 3.

As to claim 29, see similar rejection to claim 2.

As to claim 30, see similar rejection to claim 15.

As to claim 31, see similar rejection to claim 16.

Claims (58, 60-64) are computer readable medium claims corresponding to method

claims (25, 27-31). Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon method claims

respectively.

As to claim 74, see similar rejection to claim 2.

As to claim 76, see similar rejection to claim 4.

18.   Claims 32-33 and 65-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over

Arteaga et al., in view of Soin et al., and Morris, as applied to claim 24 above, and further in

view of Lueckhoff et al (US patent 7171478).

As to claim 32, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. and Morris does not expressly disclose client is a proxy client on a server <u>interfacing</u> with at least one additional server. Lueckhoff et al. discloses a proxy client on a server and server interfaced with at least one additional server (figure 3, 5-6; col. 6, lines 4-31).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. and Morris, with the method disclosed by Lueckhoff et al. regarding a proxy client on a server and server interfaced with additional server. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to use proxy to serve as intermediaries between server and external components (Lueckhoff et al., col. 6, lines 4-7).

As to claim 33, Arteaga et al in view of Soin et al. and Morris disclose a method for informing a server about the presence of network resources, said method comprising the steps of:

a) emulating a plug-and-play event notification regarding a network resource in communication with the proxy client;

b) redirecting said emulated event notification to a server; and

c) receiving, <u>in response to the redirection of the event notification, a command</u> from the server, the command directed to said network resource (See similar rejection to claim 24).

However, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. and Morris does not disclose a proxy client. Lueckhoff et al. discloses a proxy client (figure 3, 5-6; col. 6, lines 4-31).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. and Morris, with the

method disclosed by Lueckhoff et al. regarding a proxy client. See similar motivation in claim

32 rejection.

Claims (65-66) are computer readable medium claims corresponding to method claims

(32-33). Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon method claims

respectively.

Conclusion

19.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to HUA FAN whose telephone number is (571)270-5311. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am-6pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/H. F./
Examiner, Art Unit 2456

/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2456